



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,418	02/19/2002	Maria Dalko	010830-121	9294

7590

08/11/2003

Norman H. Stepno, Esquire
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

DAVIS, RUTH A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

10/076,418

Applicant(s)

DAL KO ET AL.

Examiner

Ruth A. Davis

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003 and 02 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-17 and 31-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendments filed April 25 and June 2, 2003 have been received and entered into the case. Claims 2 – 5 have been canceled and claims 31 – 38 have been added. Claims 1 and 6 – 38 are pending; claims 18 – 30 are withdrawn from consideration; and claims 1, 6 – 17 and 31 – 38 have been considered on the merits. All arguments have been fully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been withdrawn due to amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 1651

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 6 – 17 and 31 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boussouira in view of Wheeler and/or Berry.

Applicant claims a topical composition comprising an ascorbic acid precursor selected from L-galactono-1, 4-lactone, l-gulono-1, 4-lactone, D-glucorono 1, 4 lactone, D-glucuronic acid, D-mannose, D-galacturonic acid, D-glucose, D-galactose, L-galactose and mixtures thereof; and at least one enzyme that converts the precursor to ascorbic acid. The enzyme is selected from L-galactono-1, 4-lactone dehydrogenase, l-galactose dehydrogenase, l-sorbose dehydrogenase, l-gulono-1, 4 lactone oxidase and mixtures thereof, specifically L-galactono-1, 4-lactone dehydrogenase. Alternatively the enzyme originates from extracts of plants, animals, insects or microorganisms; or is a crude extract, purified enzyme solution, immobilized on a matrix (specifically sol-gel), is solid, liquid, freeze dried, or is in a controlled release device. The enzyme is 0.05 – 30% or 0.1 – 10% of the total weight and the precursor is 0.01 – 50% or 0.1 – 10% total weight. The enzyme and precursor are packaged separately, or in separate compartments; are encapsulated, microencapsulated or in microgranules; and originates from in vivo or in vitro cells. The composition further comprises ascorbic acid.

Boussouira teaches a topical composition comprising an ascorbic acid precursor, an enzyme that converts the precursor into ascorbic acid and ascorbic acid (abstract, col.4, 9-15). The enzyme is present from about 0.05 – 30%, preferably 0.1 – 10%, of the total composition

Art Unit: 1651

.. (col.2 line 59 – 66) and the precursor is 0.1 – 50%, preferably 0.5 – 10% (col.3 line 33-37). The precursor and enzyme are packaged separately so that contact is not made until application (abstract, col.2 line 34-40, col.3 line 57-64), and the composition may be encapsulated, microencapsulated, in microgranules (col.4 line 9-12) or gel forms (col.4 line 62-68).

Although Boussouira does not specifically teach the ascorbic acid is derived from in vitro or in vivo cells, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the claimed product is the same or obvious from a product in the prior art (i.e. the product disclosed in the cited reference), the claim is unpatentable even though the reference product was made by a different process. When the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be identical with or slightly different than the claimed product-by-process, rejections under 35 U.S.C 102 and/or 35 U.S.C 103 are proper. (MPEP 2113) Furthermore, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an enzyme originating from plants, animals insects or microorganisms in liquid, solid or freeze dried form because it was standard practice in the art at the time the claimed invention was made.

Boussouira does not teach the composition with the claimed enzymes and precursors. However at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any of the claimed precursors and enzymes because they were known compounds in ascorbic acid synthesis. In support, Wheeler teaches that ascorbic acid precursors l-galactose and l-galactono-1, 4-lactone are converted to ascorbic acid by l-galactose dehydrogenase (abstract). Specifically Wheeler teaches the most effective precursor of ascorbic acid is l-galactono 1, 4 lactone which is converted by l-galactono 1,4 lactone dehydrogenase (p.365). In addition, Berry teaches ascorbic acid is produced when activity of l-galactose

Art Unit: 1651

dehydrogenase and l-galactono lactone dehydrogenase is increased (0006) in the presence of ascorbic acid precursors l-galactose and l-galactono lactone (0041). Other ascorbic acid precursors that are converted include l-galactose, l-galactono lactone, d-glucose, d-galactose, d-galacturonic acid, d-glucurono lactone (table 6), d-mannose, l-gulono lactone, and d-glucuronic acid (table 8). Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Wheeler and/or Berry to use the claimed precursors and enzymes in the composition of Boussouira with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining an effective topical vitamin composition.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Boussouira teaches a topical composition while Wheeler and Berry teach the ascorbic acid synthesis pathway in plants, therefore one in the art would not be motivated to use the instant precursors and enzymes in the composition of Boussouira. Applicant further argues that one in the art would not have a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining the composition of Boussouira or Applicant.

However, these arguments fail to persuade because Boussouira clearly teaches compositions of ascorbic acid precursors in combination with enzymes will effectively produce the active vitamin (col.2 line 41 – col.3 line 1). As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would certainly have had a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining the composition with other known ascorbic acid precursors and enzymes known to convert them into vitamins.

Furthermore, the claimed precursors and enzymes do not appear to impart any unexpected

Art Unit: 1651

benefit or advantage to the resulting composition. Absence of evidence to the contrary, the claims stand rejected as being obvious over the references cited above.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth A. Davis whose telephone number is 703-308-6310. The examiner can normally be reached on M-H (7:00-4:30); altn. F (7:00-3:30).

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 703-308-0196. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Ruth A. Davis; rad
August 8, 2003



LEON B. LANKFORD, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER